



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# AMERICAN ADVOCATE OF PEACE

VOL. LIV.  
No. 8.

BOSTON, NOVEMBER, 1892.

PRICE, \$1.00  
A YEAR.

PUBLISHED BY THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY.

NO. 3 SOMERSET STREET, BOSTON, MASS.

## FROM LOCKSLEY HALL.

BY ALFRED TENNYSON.

Can I but relive in sadness? I will turn that earlier page.  
Hide me from my deep emotion, O thou wondrous Mother-Age!

Make me feel the wild pulsations that I felt before the strife,  
When I heard my days before me, and the tumult of my life;

Yearning for the large excitement that the coming years would  
yield,  
Eager-hearted as a boy when first he leaves his father's field,

And at night along the dusty highway near and nearer drawn,  
Sees in heaven the light of London flaring like a dreary dawn;

And his spirit leaps within him to be gone before him, then,  
Underneath the light he looks at, in among the throngs of men;

Men, my brothers, men the workers, ever reaping something  
new:  
That which they have done but earnest of the things that they  
shall do:

For I dipped into the future, far as human eye could see,  
Saw the vision of the world, and all the wonder that would be;

Saw the heavens fill with commerce, argosies of magic sails,  
Pilots of the purple twilight, dropping down with costly bales;

Heard the heavens fill with shouting, and there rain'd a ghastly  
dew  
From the nations' airy navies grappling in the central blue;

Far along the world-wide whisper of the south-wind rushing warm,  
With the standards of the peoples plunging thro' the thunder-  
storm;

Till the war drum throb'd no longer, and the battle-flags were  
furled

In the Parliament of man, the Federation of the world.

There the common sense of most shall hold a fretful realm in awe,  
And the kindly earth shall slumber, lapt in universal law.

## NEXT EDUCATIONAL STEP IN THE GREAT PEACE MOVEMENT.

BY GEO. N. HOSS.

In all great reforms there is always a next step, sometimes smaller, sometimes larger, but always necessary. So in the peace movement, many such steps have already been taken, as the great Pan-American Congress of 1890, recommending:

1. A definite plan of arbitration for settlement of difficulties between American nations.

2. The adoption of a similar plan by the nations of Europe.

3. That the right of conquest cannot be recognized by American nations.

This was a great step, and no doubt did much to check the hot haste and unholy spirit of war both in this country and in Chile in the late Chilean troubles.

Another great step was taken when the United States Senate authorized the President to negotiate with foreign nations for "an international agreement for the creation of a proper tribunal whereby disputes between nations may be adjusted without resort to war."

This latter is a great step as an educational factor. Although Europe cannot, or rather, will not accept this at present, yet good men cannot avoid considering it and urging it upon their respective governments. Thus it stands as a perpetual finger-board pointing nations to better things, and so a perpetual education to all who have heads to think and consciences to approve the right. This is the heaven in the meal that will work.

Now, whereas this nation has taken these great steps in the lead of other nations, the next, and to many the astounding step, is to talk, discuss and hope for *disarmament*. Of course the conservative will exclaim, too fast! not ready! The belligerent will exclaim, wild! fanatical! national safety! national honor! etc. This we expect, but "come let us reason together."

*First*, We do not say disarmament now, or next month, or next year, but we do say begin now to agitate, *to educate*. In all great changes, public sentiment must be educated, through years and decades, as in the abolition of slavery, the prohibition of the liquor traffic, the equality of all men before the law.

For clearness we consider the matter under two heads:

1. Demand. 2. Means.

The demand lies in the following facts:

(1) As long as men engage in military service they will foster a military spirit, and as a consequence, whenever there comes the least international trouble, they are ready, yea, anxious to settle the matter by war. The historic proof of this is abundant. The rationale of the case is obvious; namely, *men love to do what they are trained to do*. Men who have been killing their fellows all their lives in imagination are only too ready when opportunity offers, to kill them in fact.

(2) America can afford to lead in this educational movement for two indisputable reasons: (a) because of her strength, (b) because of her proved desire for peace. The first will prevent assault, the second will win favor.

I do not here forget the pompous talk about "national honor," but I leave this out of sight as I find nothing of the kind in Christ's teachings. If we ever reach universal peace, we will reach it through the spirit of Christ, and not through military pride and military ambition which are anti-Christ.

2. Means. Here is the strain. Strong as the United

States is, it cannot act alone. Hence, the seeming possible mode is an alliance of the American governments with England and Canada, as nearest in form of government and in race ties, and through these under a process of education, reach the two other great nations, France and Germany. This done, the rest of the world finding itself helpless in war will follow, as in the destruction of the feudal system, the abolition of slavery and other great reforms. There are fashions among nations as among individuals, and the fashions set by the great nations will be followed by the minor.

But now the grave question confronts us, how to get America and these nations to unite in disarmament? By the old process of agitation. The public mind must be informed, the public conscience quickened and public sentiment formed as in ages past, by writing, speaking, voting, acting. Hence, every man who prudently pens a line, utters a word, casts a vote, administers an office for peace, is so far forth helping to form public sentiment.

We have no hope that disarmament will come soon even in advanced America, yet we have faith, yea, an abiding conviction that it must, yes, will come. It has been written, "They shall beat their swords into ploughshares and their spears into pruning hooks." *This is disarmament.* This done, the further writ follows as consequence: "Nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." *This is universal peace.*

WICHITA, KAN.

## INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION.

BY HODGSON PRATT.

(Read at the Berne Congress.)

Under this head, the International Arbitration and Peace Association have suggested that the Congress should appoint a Committee to report on the following questions, with a view to their report being submitted to the whole Congress for discussion and the adoption of a resolution.

(a) What are the objects, the methods, and the limitations of Arbitration?

(b) Should one or several tribunals be constituted? Should these be permanent or created for a limited number of years? By what authority should they be constituted? What should be the first steps taken towards their constitution? By whom should the members of the tribunals be appointed? What should be their qualifications?

(c) Is it desirable that all International Treaties, whether of permanent character or created for an indefinite period, should contain provisions for their periodical revision?

The questions proposed are of very great importance, because, so long as the friends of arbitration do not clearly define their proposals, they lay themselves open to objections and criticisms which seriously impede belief in arbitration on the part of large classes of the community.

At the same time, the replies to these questions require most careful consideration; and all the more so that the highest authorities who have written on this subject are not agreed. Indeed, they do not always agree on some fundamental principles.

The Committee appointed by the Congress to report, may, perhaps, find some difficulty in completing their task before the close of the Congress; and, in that case, it may be well that the Committee should not dissolve, but continue their labors with a view to a complete report for the Congress of 1893.

They might, during the intervening period, consult the leading authorities on the points at issue, and perhaps ask certain specialists to join them in the preparation of a report.

2. I now desire, no doubt, in common with many others, to contribute a few notes having reference to some of the points in question. One of the most frequent objections to the suggestion that International differences should be settled by Arbitration is that questions frequently arise which can neither be referred to, nor settled by, any tribunal. The objection must be faced; and, for my part, I am prepared to face it with a denial of the assertion. I deny that there are any questions which cannot properly be decided by a competent tribunal; and I would observe, *en passant*, that two important works, which have just appeared, throw much light upon this question. One is by M. Ferdinand Dreyfus, who says there exist questions which are insoluble by Arbitration; and the other by M. Michel Revon, who says they are not. They, in common with all other advocates of Arbitration, are agreed that the independence and self-government of a nation can never be a question for any court whatever. M. Dreyfus, however, goes further than this, and says that "national honor, placed under the protection of patriotism," cannot be a question left to arbitral consideration.

I think the answer to this last objection may be found in a thorough adoption of the idea that a nation is, to all intents and purposes, a PERSON. So long as an individual lives in a community, he necessarily is the subject of Law, for thus alone can his rights, in all matters whatever, be properly determined with reference to the rights of all other members of the community. His liberty is determined by the liberty of all the rest; he has a right to complete independence only so far as it does not affect the independence of others. He is sovereign over himself, but as a member of a community he is subject to all the laws adopted for the benefit of the latter. Surely the position of a nation in relation to all other nations is precisely analogous; and the more that analogy is recognized, the more simple will be our conception of international relations, rights and duties. A nation has its sovereign rights to independence and self government, and the possession of its own territory. Directly, however, that its claims come in conflict with the claims of its sister nations, they must be judged by a competent body. No man and no nation can be judge in his or its own cause. The exception made by M. Dreyfus—that of national honor—at once reminds us of the false use of that word by individuals. In the case of the latter, it always means that a man claims to be the only judge of what is due to himself in a dispute with another; and to run the latter through the body if he does not accept his judgment. This theory, which is the basis of duelling, has disappeared in some countries out of reverence for law. Duels are only private war, and should be suppressed by all friends of international peace. So, then, when a nation talks of its "honor," it signifies that it is advancing some intangible claim which cannot be submitted to the arbitrament of any impartial man or court,